

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**A. Allowed Claims**

The Examiner indicated that claims 7-10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20, and 21 are allowed.

B. Objections to Claims

The Examiner objected to claim 23 as being incomplete because it depends from canceled claim 11. By the clarifying amendments made above, which were made to correct a typographical error and do not limit the scope of claim 23, claim 23 now depends from pending claim 22. Accordingly, this objection is believed to be overcome.

C. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 22-25, 27, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,059,199, issued to Quaney ("Quaney").

By the claim amendments made above, independent claim 22 is now limited to a component having a plurality of generally vertical members 140 that are all flush with the edge 134 of the interior surface (see FIG. 6 of the present application). In contrast, Quaney includes bosses on the longitudinal sides that are positioned beneath the edge of the interior surface and not flush with it. Quaney only teaches bosses that are flush with an edge at opposite ends of the device, i.e., at column 2, lines 10-13 of Quaney, "[a]s shown in FIG. 2, the boss 12 comprises an integral greatly thickened portion of the plastic end wall 6 of sufficient thickness to provide adequate strength for holding the cover 10." The design of the present application provides additional direct support for the weight of a cover or lid and also more evenly distributes the weight of the cover or lid around the circumference or perimeter of the component. Accordingly, claim 22 as amended is believed to include allowable subject matter and is therefore believed to overcome its rejection as well as the rejections of dependent claims 23-25, 27, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

D. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentably obvious over Quaney in view of Russell (U.S. Patent No. 4,976,366).

By the claim amendments made above, independent claim 22 is now believed to include allowable subject matter and is therefore believed to overcome its rejection as well as the rejection of dependent claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

E. Summary

In the present Office Action, claims 7-10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20-25, and 27-30 were examined. Claim 23 is objected to. Claims 22-25 and 27-30 are rejected. Claims 22 and 23 are amended. Claims 7-10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 20-25, and 27-30 are presented for consideration.


Based on the remarks above, Applicants submit that none of the references, alone or in combination, anticipates or makes obvious the invention as presently claimed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and further examination of the application and the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a Notice of Allowance at the earliest possible date.

If the Examiner has any questions or believes that a discussion with Applicants' attorney would expedite prosecution, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Please apply any credits or charge any deficiencies to our Deposit Account No. 23-1665.

Respectfully submitted,

Norman W. Gavin



Signature of Attorney
Anthony P. Gangemi
Wiggin and Dana LLP
One Century Tower
New Haven, CT 06508-1832
Telephone: (203) 498-4395
Facsimile: (203) 782-2889

Date: August 14, 2007

Reg. No. 42,565

11766741664521.1